

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 21 are pending. Claims 1 – 12 and 14 – 21 are rejected. Claim 13 is objected to because it depends from a rejected independent claim.

Please amend claims 1, 11, 14 and 18 – 21. Please cancel claim 15. Please add claim 22. The applicants' attorney respectfully asserts that claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 22, as amended, are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed below.

Objection to FIG. 2

The applicants respectfully assert that the elements that reference numbers 32, 38, 48 and 50 refer to in FIG. 2 become clearer when FIG. 2 is reviewed in conjunction with paragraphs 11, 15 and 17 of the specification and FIGS. 3 and 4. As stated in paragraph 11, reference number 32 refers to a post according to an embodiment of the invention, and reference number 38 refers to a body according to an embodiment of the invention. As stated in paragraph 15, reference numbers 48 and 50 each refer to a respective one of the first and second components of the body 38, according to an embodiment of the invention. As discussed in paragraph 17 and shown in FIG. 2 (dashed lines) and in FIG. 3, the body 38 may be positioned, according to an embodiment of the invention, by pivoting the first and second components 48 and 50, respectively.

Rejection of Claims 1 – 10

The applicants' claim 1, as amended, recites:

A post for retaining an item in a storage compartment having a side,
the post comprising:

a body operable to hold the item; and

a coupling element operable to couple the body to the side of the
storage compartment and to allow the post to be pivoted.

Support for claim 1 can be found in at least FIGS. 2 and 4, and paragraph 17 of the specification.

The applicants' attorney respectfully asserts that claim 1 is patentable over U.S. Patent 5, 400,902 (Kaminski) at least because, unlike the applicants' claimed post, Kaminski's post does not pivot.

Claims 2 – 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1, as amended.

Rejection of Claims 11 – 13

Claim 11, as amended, is patentable over Kaminski at least for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1, as amended, over Kaminski.

Claims 12 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 11, as amended.

Rejection of Claims 14 and 16 – 20

Claim 14, as amended, is patentable over Kaminski at least for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1, as amended, over Kaminski.

Claims 16 – 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 14, as amended.

Rejection of Claim 21

The enclosed Declaration shows that the inventors conceived and reduced to practice the claimed invention in the United States before 23 September 2003, which is the purported effective date of U.S. Patent 6,947,280 issued to Li (Li).

Therefore, the applicants' attorney requests that the examiner withdraw all rejections that are based in full or in part on Li.

Conclusion


The applicants' attorney respectfully requests the examiner withdraw the rejection against claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21, as amended, and issue an allowance for claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 22.

If, after considering this response, the examiner believes the claims should not be allowed, the applicants' attorney respectfully requests that before issuing an Office Action, the examiner call Mr. Janeway (425-455- 5575) to schedule a telephone conference to further the prosecution of the claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, at any time during the pendency of this application, any required fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.25.

Dated this 24th day of July 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



John M. Janeway
Registration No. 45,796

Correspondence to:
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Phone: (970) 898-3884